arXiv:1401.2748v3 [math.AC] 3 Oct 2015

.

DECOMPOSING MODULAR TENSOR PRODUCTS, AND PERIODICITY OF 'JORDAN PARTITIONS'

S. P. GLASBY, CHERYL E. PRAEGER, AND BINZHOU XIA

Abstract. Let J_r denote an $r \times r$ matrix with minimal and characteristic polynomials $(t-1)^r$. Suppose $r \leqslant s$. It is not hard to show that the Jordan canonical form of $J_r \otimes J_s$ is similar to $J_{\lambda_1} \oplus \cdots \oplus J_{\lambda_r}$ where $\lambda_1 \geqslant \cdots \geqslant \lambda_r > 0$ and $\sum_{i=1}^{r} \lambda_i = rs$. The partition $\lambda(r,s,p) := (\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_r)$ of rs, which depends only on r, s and the characteristic $p := \mathrm{char}(F)$, has many applications including to the study of algebraic groups. We prove new periodicity and duality results for $\lambda(r,s,p)$ that depend on the smallest p-power exceeding r. This generalizes results of J. A. Green, B. Srinivasan, and others which depend on the smallest p-power exceeding the (potentially large) integer s. It also implies that for fixed r we can construct a finite table allowing the computation of $\lambda(r,s,p)$ for all s and p, with $s \geqslant r$ and p prime.

AMS Subject Classification (2010): 15A69, 15A21, 13C05

1. Introduction

Consider a matrix whose minimal and characteristic polynomials equal $(t-1)^r$. To be explicit, take the $r \times r$ matrix J_r with 1s in positions (i,i) for $1 \leqslant i \leqslant r$, and $(i,i+1)$ for $1 \leqslant i < r$, and zeros elsewhere. Suppose $1 \leqslant r \leqslant s$. Then the Jordan canonical form of $J_r \otimes J_s$ is a direct sum $J_{\lambda_1} \oplus \cdots \oplus J_{\lambda_r}$, with precisely r nonempty blocks, see Lemma 9(a). This decomposition depends on the characteristic p of the underlying field[1] F, and it determines a partition $\lambda(r,s,p) = (\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_r)$ of rs since $J_r \otimes J_s$ is an $rs \times rs$ matrix. We will assume that $\lambda_1 \geqslant \cdots \geqslant \lambda_r > 0$. The determination of this 'Jordan partition'[2] has applications to many significant problems. The representation theory of algebraic groups is governed by the behaviour of the unipotent elements, and indeed properties of $\lambda(r,s,p)$ are particularly useful (when $p > 0$) for the study of exceptional algebraic groups, see [LS, rL]. More generally, Lindsey [jL, Theorem 1] gives a useful (though somewhat technical) lower bound on the degree of the minimal faithful representation in characteristic p for certain groups with a prescribed Sylow p-subgroup structure. Lindsey's result, in turn, may be applied to the study of primitive permutation groups of p-power degree, see [P].

The most direct application, and the oldest, is to the study of modular representations of finite cyclic p-groups. Given two indecomposable modules V_r and V_s of a cyclic group G

Date: October 6, 2015.

[1] We may assume that $F = \mathbb{F}_p$ or $\mathbb{Q}$ as the Jordan form of $J_r \otimes J_s$ is invariant under field extensions.

[2] This phrase was used by Dmitri Panyushev in the review MR2728146, but it is not used commonly.

of order p^n, the module $V_r \otimes V_s$ is, by the Krull-Schmidt theorem, a sum of indecomposable modules $V_{\lambda_1} \oplus \cdots \oplus V_{\lambda_r}$. Thus when $p > 0$, the partition $\lambda(r, s, p)$ arises naturally in this context too. The connection with matrices is straightforward: $G = \langle g \rangle$ has precisely p^n pairwise nonisomorphic indecomposable modules $V_1, \ldots, V_{p^n}$ which correspond to the matrix representations $G \to \mathrm{GL}(r, \mathbb{F}_p)\colon g \mapsto J_r$ where $1 \leqslant r \leqslant p^n$.

Definition 1. *The following terminology will be used as convenient abbreviations.*

(a) *For integers r, s with $1 \leqslant r \leqslant s$, the* **standard partition** $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_r)$ *of rs is the partition with $\lambda_i = r + s - 2i + 1$ for $1 \leqslant i \leqslant r$, i.e. $(s + r - 1, \ldots, s - r + 1)$.*
(b) *Call $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_r)$ the* **(r-)uniform partition** *of rs if $\lambda_i = s$, for $1 \leqslant i \leqslant r$.*
(c) *The vector $\varepsilon(r, s, p) = (\varepsilon_1, \ldots, \varepsilon_r)$ with $\varepsilon_i = \lambda_i - s$, which measures the deviation of $\lambda(r, s, p) = (\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_r)$ from the uniform vector, is called the* **deviation vector**.
(d) *The* **negative reverse** *of $(\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2, \ldots, \varepsilon_r)$ is $\overline{(\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2, \ldots, \varepsilon_r)} := (-\varepsilon_r, \ldots, -\varepsilon_2, -\varepsilon_1)$.*
(e) *The* **k-multiple** *of $(\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_r)$ is the vector $(k\lambda_1, \ldots, k\lambda_1, \ldots, k\lambda_r, \ldots, k\lambda_r)$ of length kr where the size, and multiplicity, of each part is multiplied by k.*

In characteristic zero, the partition $\lambda(r, s, 0)$ was shown to be the standard partition independently by Aitken (1934), Roth (1934), and Littlewood (1936); for more background and references see [N2, p. 416]. The change-of-basis matrix exhibiting the Jordan canonical form of $J_r \otimes J_s$ may be chosen to have rational entries, and so in 'large' prime characteristic (p not dividing denominators of the matrix entries), it follows that $\lambda(r, s, p)$ is also the standard partition. Srinivasan proved that $\lambda(r, s, p)$ is standard for $p \geqslant r + s - 1$. Our first result generalizes the main results of both [S] and [B].

Theorem 2. *If $r \leqslant s$, and $s \not\equiv 0, \pm 1, \pm 2, \ldots, \pm(r-2) \pmod p$, then $\lambda(r, s, p)$ is the standard partition; i.e. its ith part is $\lambda_i = r + s + 1 - 2i$ for $1 \leqslant i \leqslant r$.*

Throughout this paper we have $p > 0$ and $r \leqslant s$. It is useful (psychologically) to think of r as 'fixed and small', and s and p as 'variable', and s as 'large'. The seminal paper [G] by J. A. Green led to a series of different algorithms [R, S, M1, M2, R1, R2, H, II] for decomposing $V_r \otimes V_s$ as $V_{\lambda_1} \oplus \cdots \oplus V_{\lambda_r}$ where $1 \leqslant r \leqslant s \leqslant p^n$, and p^n is the smallest p-power exceeding s. One class of algorithms [G, S, M1, R1, R2] involves recursive computations in the modular representation ring (or Green ring) of the cyclic group C_{p^n}. It is known that V_{p^i} for $0 \leqslant i \leqslant n$ are generators for the Green ring; however, relations in these generators are rather mysterious. Another class of algorithms is related to p-adic expansions, and has a more number-theoretic flavour. The algorithms may depend on p-adic expansions of r and s as in [M1], or on the values of certain determinants modulo p as in [S, II], or on so called p-ranks [N1, H]. Ideally the algorithms can construct a basis relative to which $J_r \otimes J_s$ is in Jordan canonical form, see [B, N2]. No complexity analysis presently exists to compare the time or space requirements of these algorithms.

In contrast to the Green ring results which assume $1 \leqslant r \leqslant s \leqslant p^n$, we assume only that $r \leqslant \min\{s, p^m\}$. For maximum impact take p^m to be the *smallest* p-power exceeding r. We first noticed a criterion for $\lambda(r, s, p)$ to be the uniform partition.

Proposition 3. *If* $\mathrm{char}(F) = p > 0$ *and* $r \leqslant \min\{p^m, s\}$, *then* $\lambda(r,s,p)$ *is the uniform partition, or equivalently* $\varepsilon(r,s,p) = (0,\ldots,0)$, *if and only if* $s \equiv 0 \pmod{p^m}$.

Proposition 3, which is more general than [R1, Lemma 2.1], for example, suggested to us to study the deviation $\varepsilon(r,s,p) = (\lambda_1,\ldots,\lambda_r) - (s,\ldots,s)$ from the uniform partition $(s,\ldots,s)$. We found several properties of $\varepsilon(r,s,p)$ that depend only on the congruence of s modulo p^m, where $m = \lceil \log_p(r) \rceil$, see Theorem 4. These properties generalize periodicity and duality results for Green rings, *c.f.* [R1, Eq. G-1].

Theorem 4. *Suppose* $r \leqslant \min\{s, s', p^m\}$ *where* $p = \mathrm{char}(F)$.

(a) [Periodicity] *If* $s \equiv s' \pmod{p^m}$, *then* $\varepsilon(r,s,p) = \varepsilon(r,s',p)$.
(b) [Duality] *If* $s' \equiv -s \pmod{p^m}$, *then* $\varepsilon(r,s',p)$ *is the negative reverse of* $\varepsilon(r,s,p)$.

Barry [B2] has already used Theorem 4 to classify all triples (r,s,p) for which $\lambda(r,s,p)$ is standard, and Barry's result already has an application, namely determining whether so called 'Jordan permutations' are involutions or are trivial, see [GPX2].

Section 2 introduces notation and terminology whilst establishing an important result that is computationally advantageous: computing with the nilpotent matrix $J_r \otimes I_s + I_r \otimes J_s$ rather than the natural unipotent matrix $J_r \otimes J_s$, *c.f.* [T1, T2]. It is convenient to view the tensor product of vector spaces as a polynomial algebra; then submodules correspond to ideals. In Section 3 we prove the sufficient condition Theorem 2 for $\lambda(r,s,p)$ to be standard, and also prove:

Theorem 5. *If* $r \leqslant s$ *and* $k \geqslant 0$, *then* $\lambda(p^k r, p^k s, p)$ *is the* p^k*-multiple of* $\lambda(r,s,p)$.

Renaud [R1, Lemma 2.2] proved this result (using the language of Green rings) under the additional assumption that $r \leqslant s \leqslant p$ which we do not need. Our s can be large.

In Section 4 we prove Proposition 3 and Theorem 4, and find $\varepsilon(r,s,p)$ explicitly when $s \equiv \pm 1$ or $\pm 2 \pmod{p^m}$, see Propositions 13 and 14. In Section 5 we prove the following theorem.

Theorem 6. *For a fixed integer* $r \geqslant 1$, *there are at most* 2^{r-1} *different deviation vectors* $\varepsilon(r,s,p)$ *as both* s, *where* $s \geqslant r$, *and the prime* p *vary.*

It was shown in [II, Theorem 2.1.5] that a finite computation is required to determine $\lambda(r,s,p)$ when both r and s are fixed, and p varies. Table 1 lists the possible deviation vectors $\varepsilon(r,s,p)$ for $r \leqslant 5$. In Section 5 we prove the generalization (Theorem 7) which allows us to create Table 1. In the proof of Theorem 7 we show that, for a given r, the number of values of s and of p we need to consider are each bounded above in terms of r.

How is Table 1 used? This table lists the values of $\varepsilon(r,s,p)$ for $r \leqslant \min\{5,s\}$. It explicitly lists the 'small' primes $p < 2r-3$; these may have $m > 1$. The infinitely many 'large' primes $p' \geqslant 2r-3$ all have $m = 1$. For the small primes p it suffices, by duality, to list the $s \pmod{p^m}$ for which $0 \leqslant s \pmod{p^m} \leqslant p^m/2$. For the large primes p' it suffices,

by Theorem 2 and duality, to list the $s \pmod{p'}$ for which $0 \leqslant s \pmod{p'} \leqslant r-2$. The values of $s \pmod{p'}$ satisfying $r-1 \leqslant s \pmod{p'} \leqslant p'-(r-1)$, have $\lambda(r,s,p')$ standard. Thus $\varepsilon(r,s,p') = (r-1, r-3, \ldots, -(r-3), -(r-1))$ for these $p'-(2r-3)$ choices of $s \pmod{p'}$. We also list this 'standard vector' $\varepsilon(r,s,p')$ for $s \pmod{p'} = r-1$. Note that for $(r,p') = (3,3),(4,5),(5,7)$, no value of s gives rise to this standard vector as $p'-(2r-3) = 0$. When computing $\varepsilon(4,17,3)$ we have $m=2$ as $3 < 4 \leqslant 3^2$. The first equality below is by periodicity, the second is by duality, the third is by Table 1, and the fourth is by the definition (see 1(e)) of 'negative reverse':

$$\varepsilon(4,17,3) = \varepsilon(4,8,3) = \overline{\varepsilon(4,10,3)} = \overline{(3,-1,-1,-1)} = (1,1,1,-3).$$

Also $\varepsilon(5,s,11) = (4,2,0,-2,-4)$ for $s = 15,16,17,18$, and $p'-(2r-3) = 11-7 = 4$.

Theorem 7. *For fixed r, a finite computation suffices to compute the values of $\varepsilon(r,s,p)$ for all s with $s \geqslant r$, and all primes p.*

TABLE 1. Values of $\varepsilon(r,s,p)$ with $r \leqslant \min\{5,s\}$ and $m = \lceil \log_p(r) \rceil$. See the paragraph beginning 'How is Table 1 used?'; below p' is a prime $\geqslant 2r-3$.

$s \mod p^m$	0	1	2	3	4
$\varepsilon(1,s,p')$	(0)				
$\varepsilon(2,s,p')$	(0,0)	(1,–1)			
$\varepsilon(3,s,2)$	(0,0,0)	(2,–1,–1)	(2,0,–2)		
$\varepsilon(3,s,p')$	(0,0,0)	(2,–1,–1)	(2,0,–2)		
$\varepsilon(4,s,2)$	(0,0,0,0)	(3,–1,–1,–1)	(2,2,–2,–2)		
$\varepsilon(4,s,3)$	(0,0,0,0)	(3,–1,–1,–1)	(3,1,–2,–2)	(3,0,0,–3)	(3,1,–1,–3)
$\varepsilon(4,s,p')$	(0,0,0,0)	(3,–1,–1,–1)	(3,1,–2,–2)	(3,1,–1,–3)	
$\varepsilon(5,s,2)$	(0,0,0,0,0)	(4,–1,–1,–1,–1)	(4,2,–2,–2,–2)	(4,1,1,–3,–3)	(4,0,0,0,–4)
$\varepsilon(5,s,3)$	(0,0,0,0,0)	(4,–1,–1,–1,–1)	(4,2,–2,–2,–2)	(3,3,0,–3,–3)	(4,2,0,–2,–4)
$\varepsilon(5,s,5)$	(0,0,0,0,0)	(4,–1,–1,–1,–1)	(3,3,–2,–2,–2)		
$\varepsilon(5,s,p')$	(0,0,0,0,0)	(4,–1,–1,–1,–1)	(4,2,–2,–2,–2)	(4,2,0,–3,–3)	(4,2,0,–2,–4)

2. Notation and basic results

This section introduces notation and establishes facts needed for proofs in subsequent sections. Parts (a–c) of Lemma 9 have been proved before in [R, Lemma 2.1], [S, p. 678], and [M2, Theorem 2], but because we want to build on their proofs, it is desirable to give new proofs using our polynomial notation. Our alternative proofs, which are based on Lemma 8 and the preamble to Lemma 9, are much shorter than the original proofs.

Fix a positive integer r and a field F, and consider the quotient polynomial ring $B := F[X]/(X^r)$. Set $x := X + (X^r)$. Then $x^r = 0$ and $1, x, \dots, x^{r-1}$ is a basis for B. As usual, right multiplication gives rise to a monomorphism $\mu\colon B \to \operatorname{End}_F(B)$ where for $b \in B$ the F-linear map $\mu_b := \mu(b)$ satisfies $\mu_b(a) = ab$. Denote the matrices of μ_x, μ_{1+x}, and $\mu_{\alpha+x}$ relative to the basis $1, x, \dots, x^{r-1}$ by

$$N_r = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & & \\ & \ddots & \ddots & \\ & & 0 & 1 \\ & & & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad J_r = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & & \\ & \ddots & \ddots & \\ & & 1 & 1 \\ & & & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad J_r(\alpha) = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha & 1 & & \\ & \ddots & \ddots & \\ & & \alpha & 1 \\ & & & \alpha \end{pmatrix},$$

respectively. We say N_r is *nilpotent*, J_r is *unipotent*, and $J_r(\alpha)$ is *α-potent*, i.e. $J_r(\alpha) - \alpha I$ is nilpotent. Moreover, $J_r(\alpha)$ is an $r \times r$ Jordan block, and its minimal polynomial is $(t-\alpha)^r$. The matrix $J_r(\alpha) \otimes J_s(\beta)$ is an upper-triangular $\alpha\beta$-potent matrix, and so its Jordan canonical form is $\operatorname{JCF}(J_r(\alpha) \otimes J_s(\beta)) = \bigoplus_{t \geqslant 1} c_{r,s,t} J_t(\alpha\beta)$ where $c_{r,s,t} \in \mathbb{N}$ denotes the multiplicity of the $t \times t$ Jordan block $J_t(\alpha\beta)$. The Jordan partition $\lambda := \langle t^{c_{r,s,t}} \rangle$ of rs, with part size t occurring with multiplicity $c_{r,s,t}$, has been studied by many authors. In the nilpotent case (when $\alpha\beta = 0$) the multiplicities $c_{r,s,t}$ are easily described (see for example [II, 2.1.2]). Furthermore, the change of basis matrix is known, and is field independent. The invertible case (when $\alpha\beta \neq 0$) reduces to the unipotent case because

$$\operatorname{JCF}(J_r(\alpha) \otimes J_s(\beta)) = \bigoplus_{t \geqslant 1} c_{r,s,t} J_t(\alpha\beta) \quad \text{if and only if} \quad \operatorname{JCF}(J_r \otimes J_s) = \bigoplus_{t \geqslant 1} c_{r,s,t} J_t.$$

Thus the same Jordan partitions arise, and the change of basis matrices are easily related.

The quotient polynomial algebra $A := F[X,Y]/(X^r, Y^s)$ is an rs-dimensional F-vector space with basis $x^i y^j$, $0 \leqslant i < r$, $0 \leqslant j < s$, where $x := X + (X^r, Y^s)$ and $y := Y + (X^r, Y^s)$ satisfy $x^r = y^s = 0$. Given $a \in A$ denote by $F[a]$ the subalgebra $\{f(a) \mid f(t) \in F[t]\}$ of A. Then A, viewed as a module over the ring $F[a]$, is a direct sum $A = a_1 F[a] \oplus \cdots \oplus a_n F[a]$ of cyclic $F[a]$-submodules. To avoid ambiguity, we regard A as an $F[a]$-module rather than more conventionally as an $F[t]$-module, see [HH]. Indeed, $F[a]$ is a quotient of the principal ideal domain $F[t]$. We are interested in the dimensions of the cyclic submodules when $a = (1+x)(1+y)$. Since $F[a] = F[a-1]$ it is convenient to replace the invertible unipotent element $(1+x)(1+y)$ with the nilpotent element $(1+x)(1+y)-1 = x+y+xy$. We show that $x+y+xy$ and $x+y$ induce *similar* linear transformations on A. The action of $x+y$ on the basis $x^i y^j$ is simple: $x^i y^j (x+y) = x^{i+1} y^j + x^i y^{j+1}$. We seek another basis $f_{i,j}$ for A such that $f_{i,j}(x+y+xy) = f_{i+1,j} + f_{i,j+1}$. An easy calculation shows that $f_{i,j} = x^i (1+y)^i y^j$, $0 \leqslant i < r$, $0 \leqslant j < s$, is the desired basis. This is a major point in [T1, T2]. View A as a module over

$$F[(1+x)(1+y)] = F[x+y+xy], \quad \text{or over} \quad F[x+y]. \tag{1}$$

(Incidentally, when decomposing $J_r \otimes J_s \otimes J_t$ it is similarly useful to consider a module over $F[x+y+z]$ instead of $F[(1+x)(1+y)(1+z)]$ by using $f_{i,j,k} = x^i (1+y)^i (1+z)^i y^j (1+z)^j z^k$.)

View the basis elements $x^i y^j$, $0 \leqslant i < r$, $0 \leqslant j < s$, of A as placed on an $r \times s$ rectangle, see Figure 1(a). Consider the following 'horizontal', 'vertical', and 'diagonal' ideals of A:

$$\begin{aligned} H_k &= \langle x^i y^j \mid i \geqslant k \rangle, & A = H_0 > H_1 > \cdots > H_r = 0, \\ V_k &= \langle x^i y^j \mid j \geqslant k \rangle, & A = V_0 > V_1 > \cdots > V_s = 0, \\ D_k &= \langle x^i y^j \mid i + j \geqslant k \rangle, & A = D_0 > D_1 > \cdots > D_{r+s-1} = 0. \end{aligned}$$

The matrix of $\mu_{(1+x)(1+y)}$ is $J_r \otimes J_s$ relative to the basis $x^i y^j$, $0 \leqslant i < r$, $0 \leqslant j < s$, ordered lexicographically by i, then j. The action of $\mu_{(1+x)(1+y)}$ on the above ideals and their quotients (relative to this monomial basis) is given in Table 2.

TABLE 2. The action of $\mu_{(1+x)(1+y)}$ on submodules and quotient modules of A.

H_k	A/H_k	V_k	A/V_k	H_{k-1}/H_k	V_{k-1}/V_k	D_{k-1}/D_k
$J_{r-k} \otimes J_s$	$J_k \otimes J_s$	$J_r \otimes J_{s-k}$	$J_r \otimes J_k$	J_s	J_r	I

Since H_{k-1}/H_k is a cyclic $F[x+y]$-module (generated by $x^{k-1} + H_k$), it follows that A is a sum of at most r cyclic $F[x+y]$-submodules. Indeed, $A = \sum_{i=0}^{r-1} x^i F[x+y]$. Conversely, A is a sum of at least r cyclic $F[x+y]$-submodules because D_{r-1}/D_r is an

FIGURE 1. (a) $r \times s$ basis elements $x^i y^j$; and (b)–(d) dimensions of sections.



r-dimensional vector space, and $D_{r-1}(x+y) \subseteq D_r$. Thus A is a sum of precisely r nonzero cyclic $F[x+y]$-submodules and $\lambda(r,s,p)$ has precisely r nonzero parts, see Lemma 9(a) below. The dimensions of the sections H_{k-1}/H_k, V_{k-1}/V_k and D_{k-1}/D_k can be seen from Figure 1(b)–(d) to be:

$$\begin{aligned} &\dim(H_{k-1}/H_k) = s && \text{for } 1 \leqslant k \leqslant r, \\ &\dim(V_{k-1}/V_k) = r && \text{for } 1 \leqslant k \leqslant s, \\ &\dim(D_{k-1}/D_k) = \min\{k, r, r+s-k\} && \text{for } 1 \leqslant k < r+s. \end{aligned}$$

Define the *annihilator* of an element $a \in A$ to be $\mathrm{Ann}(a) = \{b \in A \mid ab = 0\}$. Then $\mathrm{Ann}(x+y)$ is an r-dimensional $F[x+y]$-submodule of A because $\lambda(r,s,p)$ has precisely r nonzero parts, as proved above; see also Lemmas 8(b) and 9(a).

Henceforth view A as an $F[x+y]$-module. The dimension of the cyclic submodule $aF[x+y]$ is the smallest natural number $n = n(a)$ satisfying $a(x+y)^n = 0$. Clearly

$(x+y)^i \neq 0$ for $0 \leqslant i < s$. Simplifying $(x+y)^n = \sum_{i+j=n} \binom{n}{i} x^i y^j$ using $x^r = y^s = 0$ gives

$$(x+y)^n = \sum_{i=n-s+1}^{r-1} \binom{n}{i} x^i y^{n-i} \qquad \text{for } s \leqslant n < r+s-1. \tag{2}$$

Eq. (2) implies that $(x+y)^n = 0$ for $n \geqslant r+s-1$ because an empty sum is zero. This shows that $s \leqslant \lambda_1 \leqslant r+s-1$. Homogeneous polynomials will play an important role.

Lemma 8. *Suppose* $\operatorname{char}(F) = p$ *and* $w = \sum_{i=n-s+1}^{r-1} \alpha_i x^i y^{n-i}$ *where* $s-1 \leqslant n \leqslant r+s-2$.

(a) $w(x+y) = 0$ *holds if and only if* w *is a scalar multiple of* $\sum_{i=n-s+1}^{r-1} (-1)^i x^i y^{n-i}$.
(b) *If* $w_i := \sum_{j=0}^{i} (-1)^j x^{r-1-j} y^{s-1-i+j}$, *then* $w_0, \dots, w_{r-1}$ *is an* F*-basis for* $\operatorname{Ann}(x+y)$.
(c) *If* $\dim(F[x+y]) = n$, *then* $(x+y)^n = 0$ *and* $(x+y)^{n-1} \neq 0$. *Moreover,*

$$(x+y)^{n-1} = (-1)^{r-1} \binom{n-1}{r-1} \sum_{i=n-s}^{r-1} (-x)^i y^{n-1-i} \quad \text{and} \quad \binom{n-1}{r-1} \neq 0 \text{ in } F.$$

Proof. (a) Expanding $w(x+y)$ and using $x^r = y^s = 0$ gives

$$\alpha_{n-s+1} x^{n-s+2} y^{s-1} + \alpha_{n-s+2} x^{n-s+3} y^{s-2} + \cdots + \alpha_{r-3} x^{r-2} y^{n-r+3} + \alpha_{r-2} x^{r-1} y^{n-r+2} +$$
$$\alpha_{n-s+2} x^{n-s+2} y^{s-1} + \alpha_{n-s+3} x^{n-s+3} y^{s-2} + \cdots + \alpha_{r-2} x^{r-2} y^{n-r+3} + \alpha_{r-1} x^{r-1} y^{n-r+2}.$$

Thus $w(x+y) = 0$ holds if and only if $\alpha_i = -\alpha_{i+1}$ for $n-s+1 \leqslant i \leqslant r-2$, as desired.

(b) As w_i is homogeneous of degree $r+s-2-i$, it follows that $w_0, \dots, w_{r-1}$ are F-linearly independent. The proof of part (a) shows that $w_i(x+y) = 0$ for each i. This proves that $\dim(\operatorname{Ann}(x+y)) \geqslant r$. To prove $\dim(\operatorname{Ann}(x+y)) \leqslant r$, we relate v and $v' := v(x+y)$. If

$$v = \sum_{i=0}^{r-1} \sum_{j=0}^{s-1} v_{i,j} x^i y^j \quad \text{and} \quad v' = \sum_{i=0}^{r-1} \sum_{j=0}^{s-1} v'_{i,j} x^i y^j,$$

then $v'_{i,n+1-i} = v_{i-1,n-(i+1)} + v_{i,n-i}$. Suppose there exists $n < r+s-2$ and $i < r$ such that

$$v_{i',j'} = 0 \text{ whenever } i'+j' < n, \quad v_{i',n-i'} = 0 \text{ for } i' < i, \text{ and } \quad v_{i,n-i} \neq 0.$$

Then $v'_{i,n+1-i} = v_{i,n-i}$, so $v'_{i,n+1-i} x^i y^{n+1-i} \neq 0$ and $v(x+y) \neq 0$. Hence an element $v \in \operatorname{Ann}(x+y)$ is a sum $v = \sum_{n=s-1}^{r+s-2} v_n$, where each summand is a homogeneous polynomial $v_n = \sum_{i=n-s+1}^{r-1} v_{i,n-i} x^i y^{n-i}$ of degree n. Since $v_n(x+y)$ is homogeneous of degree $n+1$, the equation $\sum_{n=s-1}^{r+s-2} v_n(x+y) = 0$ implies $v_n(x+y) = 0$ for $s-1 \leqslant n \leqslant r+s-2$. It now follows from part (a) that v is a linear combination of $w_0, w_1, \dots, w_{r-1}$. Thus $w_0, w_1, \dots, w_{r-1}$ is a basis for $\operatorname{Ann}(x+y)$ as claimed.

(c) Now $\dim(F[x+y]) = n$ implies $(x+y)^n = 0$. Since $(x+y)^{n-1}$ is a homogeneous polynomial in $\operatorname{Ann}(x+y)$, part (a) shows that $(x+y)^{n-1} = \beta \sum_{i=n-s}^{r-1} (-x)^i y^{n-1-i}$ for some $\beta \in F$. The binomial theorem shows that $\beta = (-1)^{r-1} \binom{n-1}{r-1}$. Since $(x+y)^{n-1} \neq 0$, we must have $\beta \neq 0$ in F. $\square$

It follows from Lemma 8(c) that $\dim(x^0F[x+y]) = \lambda_1$, and the coefficient of $x^{\lambda_1-s}y^{s-1}$ in $(x+y)^{\lambda_1-1}$ is nonzero. Now $x^i(x^{\lambda_1-s}y^{s-1}) \neq 0$ for $0 \leqslant i \leqslant r+s-1-\lambda_1$. Thus $x^i(x+y)^{\lambda_1-1} \neq 0$ and hence $\dim(x^iF[x+y]) = \lambda_1$. Therefore the $F[x+y]$-submodule $A' = \bigoplus_{i=0}^{r+s-1-\lambda_1} x^iF[x+y]$ has dimension $\lambda_1(r+s-\lambda_1)$ as each of the $r+s-\lambda_1$ summands has dimension λ_1. Any $F[t]$-submodule (or $F[x+y]$-submodule) of maximal dimension λ_1 is known to have an $F[t]$-submodule complement, see [HH, Ex. 9.2, p. 149]. Hence $A = A' \oplus A''$ for some $F[x+y]$-submodule A''. Lemma 8(c) gives $\dim(x^iF[x+y]) < \lambda_1$ for $i \geqslant r+s-\lambda_1$. Since $A = \sum_{i=0}^{r-1} x^iF[x+y]$, it follows that $A''(x+y)^{\lambda_1-1} = 0$ and the multiplicity k of the part λ_1 is $k = r+s-\lambda_1$. Substituting $n = \lambda_1 = r+s-k$ into Lemma 8(c) gives an alternate proof of Lemma 9(c) below. In the next section we prove that Theorem 2 implies Lemma 9(b) when $p > 0$, and hence when $p \geqslant 0$. The ideas established in this section will be needed for the proof of our main results.

Lemma 9. *Suppose $1 \leqslant r \leqslant s$ and F is a field of characteristic $p \geqslant 0$.*

(a) *If $p \geqslant 0$, then the partition $\lambda(r,s,p)$ of rs has precisely r nonzero parts.*
(b) *If $p = 0$ or $p \geqslant r+s-1$, then $\lambda_i = r+s-2i+1$ for $1 \leqslant i \leqslant r$.*
(c) *If $p > 0$, then $\lambda_1 = r+s-k$ where $k \geqslant 1$ is minimal such that $p \nmid \binom{r+s-1-k}{r-1}$. Moreover, the part λ_1 has multiplicity k in the partition $\lambda(r,s,p)$.*

Proof. Parts (a), (b) and (c) have been proved by Ralley, Srinivasan, and McFall, respectively in [R, Lemma 2.1], [S, p. 678], and [M2, Theorem 2]. □

Lemma 9(c) suggests an algorithm for computing the largest part λ_1 and its multiplicity. It is sometimes difficult to predict the output of this algorithm, but if s is 'not too large' then $\lambda_1 = p^m$ where $m = \lceil \log_p(r) \rceil$. A precise formulation is given in [GPX]. More importantly, new symmetries and applications of these symmetries are described in [GPX].

3. The standard partition

Recall that $r \leqslant s$ and $p > 0$ is prime. The hypothesis $s \not\equiv 0, \pm 1, \ldots, \pm(r-2) \pmod p$ in Theorem 2 implies that $p \geqslant 2r-3$. As we are thinking of s as 'large' compared to r, this is a weaker hypothesis than $p \geqslant r+s-1$ in [B, Corollary 1].

Proof of Theorem 2. The strategy of this proof is to show that there exist elements $v_0, v_1, \ldots, v_{r-1} \in A$ satisfying

(i) $\dim(v_iF[x+y]) = r+s-2i+1$, and
(ii) $v_iF[x+y] \cap \sum_{j \neq i} v_jF[x+y] = 0$.

The sum $\sum_{i=0}^{r-1} v_iF[x+y]$ is direct by (ii). Since $\sum_{i=0}^{r-1}(r+s-2i+1) = rs$ holds, it follows by (i) that $A = \bigoplus_{i=0}^{r-1} v_iF[x+y]$ and $\lambda_i = r+s-2i+1$, as claimed.

Choose an F-basis $w_0, w_1, \ldots, w_{r-1}$ for $\mathrm{Ann}(x+y)$. We prove that under the stated hypotheses there exist elements $v_i \in A$ satisfying $v_i(x+y)^{s+r-2-2i} = w_i$ for each i. This implies that (i) holds, and (ii) holds because $w_iF[x+y]$ is the unique minimal $F[x+y]$-submodule of $v_iF[x+y]$ and $w_iF[x+y] \cap \bigoplus_{j\neq i} w_jF[x+y] = 0$ holds.

Set $w_i := \sum_{j=0}^{i}(-1)^j x^{r-1-j}y^{s-1-i+j}$. Then $w_0, w_1, \ldots, w_{r-1}$ is a basis for $\mathrm{Ann}(x+y)$ by Lemma 8(b). Suppose that v_i has the form $v_i = \sum_{k=0}^{i} \nu_k x^{i-k}y^k$ where the $\nu_k \in F$ are unknowns which (we will see) can be chosen so that $v_i(x+y)^{s+r-2-2i} = w_i$. The heart of the proof is that, for each i, we can solve for the ν_k. Each of v_i, $(x+y)^{s+r-2-2i}$ and w_i is homogeneous, and $\deg(v_i) + \deg((x+y)^{s+r-2-2i}) = \deg(w_i)$. The binomial theorem gives

$$\begin{aligned} v_i(x+y)^{s+r-2-2i} &= \left(\sum_{k=0}^{i} \nu_k x^{i-k}y^k\right)\left(\sum_{\ell=0}^{s+r-2-2i} \binom{s+r-2-2i}{\ell} x^\ell y^{s+r-2-2i-\ell}\right) \\ &= \sum_{k=0}^{i}\sum_{\ell=0}^{s+r-2-2i} \nu_k \binom{s+r-2-2i}{\ell} x^{i-k+\ell}y^{s+r-2-2i-\ell+k}. \end{aligned}$$

However, $i-k+\ell \leqslant r-1$ and $s+r-2-2i-\ell+k \leqslant s-1$ implies $r-1-2i+k \leqslant \ell \leqslant r-1-i+k$. Setting $j := (r-1-i+k) - \ell$ gives the simpler range $i \geqslant j \geqslant 0$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} v_i(x+y)^{s+r-2-2i} &= \sum_{k=0}^{i}\sum_{j=0}^{i} \nu_k \binom{s+r-2-2i}{r-1-i-j+k} x^{r-1-j}y^{s-1-i+j} \\ &= \sum_{j=0}^{i}\left[\sum_{k=0}^{i} \nu_k \binom{s+r-2-2i}{s-1-i+j-k}\right] x^{r-1-j}y^{s-1-i+j} \end{aligned}$$

As we want $v_i(x+y)^{s+r-2-2i} = w_i = \sum_{j=0}^{i}(-1)^j x^{r-1-j}y^{s-1-i+j}$, equating coefficients of $x^{r-1-j}y^{s-1-i+j}$ for $0 \leqslant j \leqslant i$ gives the linear system

$$\left(\nu_0, \nu_1, \ldots, \nu_i\right) A_{i+1} = \left(1, -1, \ldots, (-1)^i\right) \quad \text{where} \quad A_{i+1} = \left(\tbinom{s+r-2-2i}{s-1-i+j-k}\right)_{0\leqslant j,k\leqslant i}. \tag{3}$$

The matrix $A_i = \left(\binom{s+r-2i}{s-i+j-k}\right)_{0\leqslant j,k\leqslant i-1}$ equals the matrix $M(i-1)$ defined on [II, p. 145]. The determinants $\delta_i := \det(A_i)$, $1 \leqslant i \leqslant r-1$, play an important role. Since A_r is upper triangular, we see $\delta_r = 1$. The following formula for δ_i is given on [II, p. 145]:

$$\delta_i = \det(A_i) = \prod_{j=0}^{i-1} \frac{\binom{r+s-2i+j}{s-i}}{\binom{s-i+j}{s-i}} = \prod_{j=0}^{i-1}\prod_{k=0}^{s-i-1} \frac{r+s-2i+j-k}{s-i+j-k}. \tag{4}$$

However, $(r+s-2i+j) - (r-i+k) = s-i+j-k$ is a factor of the numerator and the denominator for $k = 0, 1, \ldots, s-r-1$. We cancel these factors, and use the falling factorial notation $n^{\underline{i}} := n(n-1)\cdots(n-i+1)$ for $i > 0$ and $n^{\underline{0}} := 1$. For $0 \leqslant i \leqslant r-1$

we have

$$\begin{aligned}\delta_i &= \prod_{j=0}^{i-1} \frac{(r+s-2i+j)(r+s-2i+j-1)\cdots(s-i+j+1)}{(r-i+j)(r-i+j-1)\cdots(j+1)} \\ &= \frac{(r+s-i-1)^{\underline{i}}\,(r+s-i-2)^{\underline{i}}\,\cdots\,s^{\underline{i}}}{(r-1)^{\underline{i}}\,(r-2)^{\underline{i}}\,\cdots\,i^{\underline{i}}} \qquad (5)\\ &= \prod_{k=0}^{r-1-i} \frac{(r+s-1-i-k)^{\underline{i}}}{(r-1-k)^{\underline{i}}}.\end{aligned}$$

Equation (5) is most helpful when i is close to $r-1$, and Equation (4) when i is close to 1. The following variant of (4) uses the identity $\binom{r+s-2i+j}{r-i+j}\binom{r-i+j}{j} = \binom{r+s-2i+j}{r-i}\binom{s-i+j}{j}$:

$$\delta_i = \det(A_i) = \prod_{j=0}^{i-1} \frac{\binom{r+s-2i+j}{s-i}}{\binom{s-i+j}{s-i}} = \prod_{j=0}^{i-1} \frac{\binom{r+s-2i+j}{r-i+j}}{\binom{s-i+j}{j}} = \prod_{j=0}^{i-1} \frac{\binom{r+s-2i+j}{r-i}}{\binom{r-i+j}{j}}. \qquad (6)$$

TABLE 3. Values of δ_i computed using Eq. (6) for i small, and Eq. (5) for i large.

δ_0	δ_1	δ_2	$\cdots$	δ_{r-2}	δ_{r-1}	δ_r
1	$\binom{r+s-2}{r-1}$	$\frac{1}{r-1}\binom{r+s-4}{r-2}\binom{r+s-3}{r-2}$	$\cdots$	$\binom{s+2}{r-1}\binom{s+1}{r-2}$	$\binom{s}{r-1}$	1

A sufficient condition for $\lambda(r,s,p)$ to be standard is that $\delta_1\delta_2\cdots\delta_{r-1} \not\equiv 0 \pmod p$. Consider a lower bound for a typical factor $(r+s-1-i-k)^{\underline{i}} = \prod_{\ell=0}^{i-1}(r+s-1-i-k-\ell)$ of the numerator of (5). Using $0 \leqslant \ell < i$, $0 \leqslant k \leqslant r-1-i$, and $1 \leqslant i \leqslant r-1$ gives

$$r+s-1-i-k-\ell \geqslant r+s-2i-k \geqslant s-i+1 \geqslant s-(r-2). \qquad (7)$$

(Note that a lower bound for a factor of the numerator of (4) is too small. The canceling required to deduce (5) from (4) was necessary.) An upper bound for a factor of the numerator of (5) can be similarly deduced as follows:

$$r+s-1-i-k-\ell \leqslant r+s-1-i-k \leqslant r+s-1-i \leqslant s+(r-2). \qquad (8)$$

Equations (7) and (8) prove that the factors of the numerator of δ_i are bounded between $s-(r-2)$ and $s+(r-2)$. Hence the assumption $s \not\equiv 0, \pm1, \pm2, \ldots, \pm(r-2) \pmod p$ implies that $\delta_1\delta_2\cdots\delta_{r-1} \not\equiv 0 \pmod p$. Therefore $(\nu_0, \nu_1, \ldots, \nu_i)$ in Eq. (3) can be found, and $\dim(v_iF[x+y]) = r+s-1-2i$ holds by Lemma 8(c). Thus $\varepsilon(r,s,p)$ is standard. □

We now prove that $\lambda(pr,ps,p)$ is the p-multiple of $\lambda(r,s,p)$, see Definition 1(e).

Proof of Theorem 5. It suffices to prove the result when $k=1$. Set $F := \mathbb{F}_p$, and consider the p^2rs-dimensional F-algebra $\hat{A}$ with commuting generators $\hat{x}$ and $\hat{y}$, and relations $\hat{x}^{pr} = \hat{y}^{ps} = 0$. The F-subalgebra A generated by $x := \hat{x}^p$ and $y := \hat{y}^p$ has dimension rs

and satisfies $x^r = y^s = xy - yx = 0$. By the binomial theorem, $(\hat{x}+\hat{y})^p = x+y$. Suppose that the decomposition of A into cyclic $F[x+y]$-submodules gives rise to the partition $\lambda(r,s,p) = (\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_r)$. To determine the partition $\lambda(pr, ps, p)$ we consider (using (1)) the decomposition of $\hat{A}$ into cyclic $F[\hat{x}+\hat{y}]$-submodules.

Suppose that $A = \bigoplus_{i=1}^{r} a_i F[x+y]$ where $\dim(a_i F[x+y]) = \lambda_i$. We will prove that $\hat{A} = \bigoplus_{i=1}^{r} \bigoplus_{j=0}^{p-1} a_i \hat{x}^j F[x+y]$ where $\dim(a_i \hat{x}^j F[\hat{x}+\hat{y}]) = p\lambda_i$ for $0 \leqslant j < p$. Since $a_i(x+y)^{\lambda_i} = 0$ and $a_i(x+y)^{\lambda_i - 1} \neq 0$, it follows that $a_i(\hat{x}+\hat{y})^{p\lambda_i} = 0$ and $a_i(\hat{x}+\hat{y})^{p(\lambda_i-1)} \neq 0$. However, to show $\dim(a_i \hat{x}^j F[\hat{x}+\hat{y}]) = p\lambda_i$, we must prove that $a_i \hat{x}^j (\hat{x}+\hat{y})^{p\lambda_i - 1} \neq 0$.

Since $0 \neq a_i(x+y)^{\lambda_i - 1} \in A$ and $(\hat{x}+\hat{y})^p = x+y$, there exist scalars $\alpha_{i,i',j'} \in F$, not all zero, such that $a_i(\hat{x}+\hat{y})^{p\lambda_i - p} = \sum_{i'=0}^{r-1} \sum_{j'=0}^{s-1} \alpha_{i,i',j'} \hat{x}^{pi'} \hat{y}^{pj'}$. Since $\binom{p-1}{i''}$ equals $(-1)^{i''}$ in $\mathbb{F}_p$, we have $(\hat{x}+\hat{y})^{p-1} = \sum_{i''=0}^{p-1} (-1)^{i''} \hat{x}^{i''} \hat{y}^{p-1-i''}$. Multiplying by $(\hat{x}+\hat{y})^{p-1}$ gives

$$a_i(\hat{x}+\hat{y})^{p\lambda_i - 1} = \sum_{i'=0}^{r-1} \sum_{j'=0}^{s-1} \alpha_{i,i',j'} \left(\sum_{i''=0}^{p-1} (-1)^{i''} \hat{x}^{i''} \hat{y}^{p-1-i''} \right) \hat{x}^{pi'} \hat{y}^{pj'}. \tag{9}$$

However, the prs basis elements $\hat{x}^k \hat{y}^\ell$ in (9) are nonzero and distinct. Thus, since not all scalars $\alpha_{i,i',j'}$ are zero, it follows that $a_i(\hat{x}+\hat{y})^{p\lambda_i - 1} \neq 0$. Hence $\dim(W_i) = p\lambda_i$ where $W_i := a_i F[\hat{x}+\hat{y}]$ for $1 \leqslant i \leqslant r$.

We now prove that $\hat{A} = \bigoplus_{i=1}^{r} \bigoplus_{j=0}^{p-1} (1+\hat{x})^j W_i$. The following decompositions

$$F[\hat{x}] = \bigoplus_{i=0}^{p-1} \hat{x}^i F[\hat{x}^p] = \bigoplus_{i=0}^{p-1} (1+\hat{x})^i F[\hat{x}^p] \quad \text{and} \quad F[\hat{y}] = \bigoplus_{j=0}^{p-1} \hat{y}^i F[\hat{y}^p] = \bigoplus_{j=0}^{p-1} (1+\hat{y})^j F[\hat{y}^p]$$

imply that $\hat{A} = F[\hat{x}, \hat{y}] \cong F[\hat{x}] \otimes_F F[\hat{y}]$ may be decomposed as

$$\hat{A} = \bigoplus_{i=0}^{p-1} \bigoplus_{j=0}^{p-1} (1+\hat{x})^i (1+\hat{y})^j F[\hat{x}^p] \otimes_F F[\hat{y}^p] = \bigoplus_{i=0}^{p-1} \bigoplus_{j=0}^{p-1} (1+\hat{x})^i (1+\hat{y})^j A.$$

Now $(1+\hat{x})^{kp}(1+\hat{y})^{\ell p} A = (1+x)^k (1+y)^\ell A = A$ and so $(1+\hat{x})^i (1+\hat{y})^j A = (1+\hat{x})^{i'} (1+\hat{y})^{j'} A$ holds if $i \equiv i' \pmod{p}$ and $j \equiv j' \pmod{p}$. Setting $k = i - j$ gives

$$\hat{A} = \bigoplus_{k=0}^{p-1} (1+\hat{x})^k \bigoplus_{j=0}^{p-1} (1+\hat{x})^j (1+\hat{y})^j A = \bigoplus_{k=0}^{p-1} (1+\hat{x})^k A F[(1+\hat{x})(1+\hat{y})],$$

because $(1+\hat{x})^p (1+\hat{y})^p \in A$. However, we may replace $F[(1+\hat{x})(1+\hat{y})]$ with $F[\hat{x}+\hat{y}]$ by (1). Using $A = \bigoplus_{i=1}^{r} a_i F[x+y]$ and $F[x+y] \subseteq F[\hat{x}+\hat{y}]$ now gives

$$\hat{A} = \bigoplus_{k=0}^{p-1} (1+\hat{x})^k \bigoplus_{i=1}^{r} a_i F[x+y] F[\hat{x}+\hat{y}] = \bigoplus_{i=1}^{r} \bigoplus_{k=0}^{p-1} a_i (1+\hat{x})^k F[\hat{x}+\hat{y}].$$

Finally, $(1+\hat{x})^k$ is invertible, and so $\dim(a_i(1+\hat{x})^k F[\hat{x}+\hat{y}]) = p\lambda_i$, as desired. $\square$

4. Periodicity and duality

Let p^m be the smallest power of $p = \mathrm{char}(F)$ satisfying $r \leqslant p^m$. In this section we prove periodicity and a duality results which depend on p^m. The deviation vector $\varepsilon(r,s,p) := (\varepsilon_1, \ldots, \varepsilon_r)$ in Definition 1(c) satisfies $\sum_{i=1}^r \varepsilon_i = 0$ since $\sum_{i=1}^r \lambda_i = rs$. It turns out that periodicity and a duality are satisfied by the deviation vector $\varepsilon(r,s,p)$, but not the partition $\lambda(r,s,p)$. The following lemma characterizes when $\varepsilon(r,s,p) = (0,\ldots,0)$; Proposition 3 follows from it.

Lemma 10. *Suppose that* $\mathrm{char}(F) = p$ *and* $r \leqslant \min\{p^m, s\}$.

(a) *If* $s \equiv 0 \pmod{p^m}$, *then* $(x+y)^s = 0$, $A = \bigoplus_{i=0}^{r-1} x^i F[x+y]$, *and* $x^i(x+y)^{s-1} \neq 0$ *for* $0 \leqslant i < r$. *Consequently,* $\varepsilon(r,s,p) = (0,0,\ldots,0)$.
(b) *If* $\varepsilon(r,s,p) = (0,0,\ldots,0)$, *then* $s \equiv 0 \pmod{p^m}$.

Proof. (a) Suppose that $s = kp^m$ where k is an integer. Then $(x+y)^{p^m} = x^{p^m} + y^{p^m} = y^{p^m}$ as $0 = x^r = x^{p^m}$. Thus $(x+y)^{kp^m} = y^{kp^m} = y^s = 0$. It follows from $x^i(x+y)^s = 0$ that $\dim(x^iF[x+y]) \leqslant s$. However, $A = \sum_{i=0}^{r-1} x^iF[x+y]$ has dimension rs, and so the sum must be direct. Thus $\dim(x^iF[x+y]) = s$, and $x^i(x+y)^{s-1} \neq 0$ holds for $0 \leqslant i < r$.

(b) It follows from $\varepsilon_1 = 0$ that $\lambda_1 = s$, and hence that $(x+y)^s = 0$. Equation (2) gives $\sum_{i=1}^{r-1} \binom{s}{i} x^i y^{s-i} = 0$ and thus $\binom{s}{i} = 0$ in $\mathbb{F}_p$ for $1 \leqslant i \leqslant r-1$. A theorem of Lucas [Gr, p. 2] says that $\binom{s}{i} \equiv \prod_{k\geqslant 0} \binom{s_k}{i_k} \pmod p$ where $s = \sum_{k\geqslant 0} s_k p^k$ and $i = \sum_{k\geqslant 0} i_k p^k$ are the base-p expansions of s and i, respectively. As $p^{m-1} < r \leqslant p^m$, we have $p^{m-1} \leqslant r-1$. Putting $i = 1, p, \ldots, p^{m-1}$ into Lucas' theorem shows that $s_0 = s_1 = \cdots = s_{m-1} = 0$. In other words, $s \equiv 0 \pmod{p^m}$. □

The following lemma can be proved naturally using the theory of modules over principal ideal rings, see [CK]. However, in the absence of a good reference, our proof makes use of the more familiar theory of modules over principal ideal domains.

Lemma 11. *Suppose that* $\overline{D} := D/(\alpha^n)$ *where* D *is a principal ideal domain and* $\alpha \in D$ *is prime. Suppose* $1 \leqslant j \leqslant r$ *and* M *is a free* $\overline{D}$*-module with basis* $e_1, \ldots, e_r$, *and* $N = \bigoplus_{i=1}^j x_i\overline{D}$ *is a submodule of* M *with* $\mathrm{Ann}(x_i) = (\alpha^{n_i})/(\alpha^n) \neq \overline{D}$ *for* $i = 1, \ldots, j$. *Then* $M/N \cong \bigoplus_{i=1}^r D/(\alpha^{n-n_i})$ *where* $n_i = 0$ *for* $j < i \leqslant r$.

Proof. We can (and will) initially view M as a module over the principal ideal domain D. Since $x_i\alpha^{n_i} = 0$ for $i = 1, \ldots, j$, and $\alpha \in D$ is prime, it follows from the theory of D-modules [HH, Lemma 9.1] that $x_i = y_i\alpha^{n-n_i}$ for some $y_i \in M$. Now view M as a $\overline{D}$-module. Let $(y_1, \ldots, y_j) = (e_1, \ldots, e_r)Y$ where Y is an $r \times j$ matrix over $\overline{D}$. Then

$$\bigoplus_{i=1}^j y_i\overline{\alpha}^{\,n-1}\overline{D} = \bigoplus_{i=1}^j (y_i\overline{\alpha}^{\,n-n_i})\overline{\alpha}^{\,n_i-1}\overline{D} = \bigoplus_{i=1}^j x_i\overline{\alpha}^{\,n_i-1}\overline{D}$$

is a j-dimensional linear space over the field $\overline{D}/(\overline{\alpha}) = D/(\alpha)$. We conclude that there exists a $j \times j$ minor Y_1 of Y such that $\det(Y_1)$ is a unit in the local ring $\overline{D}$. (The set of units of $\overline{D}$ equals $\overline{D} \setminus (\overline{\alpha})$ as α is prime in D.) Without loss of generality, suppose that Y_1 comprises the first j rows (and all j columns) of Y. Let Y_2 comprise the bottom $r-j$ rows of Y. Then

$$(y_1, \ldots, y_j) = (e_1, \ldots, e_j)Y_1 + (e_{j+1}, \ldots, e_r)Y_2. \tag{10}$$

Postmultiplying (10) by Y_1^{-1} and rearranging gives

$$(e_1, \ldots, e_j) = (y_1, \ldots, y_j)Y_1^{-1} - (e_{j+1}, \ldots, e_r)Y_2Y_1^{-1}, \text{ and hence}$$

$$(e_1, \ldots, e_j, e_{j+1}, \ldots, e_r) = (y_1, \ldots, y_j, e_{j+1}, \ldots, e_r) \begin{pmatrix} Y_1^{-1} & 0 \\ -Y_2Y_1^{-1} & I \end{pmatrix}.$$

The above $r \times r$ matrix is invertible over $\overline{D}$. Hence $y_1, \ldots, y_j, e_{j+1}, \ldots, e_r$ is also a $\overline{D}$-basis of the free $\overline{D}$-module M. With bases for M and N aligned, it follows that

$$M/N \cong \bigoplus_{i=1}^{r} D/(\alpha^{n-n_i})$$

where $n_i = 0$ for $j < i \leqslant r$. □

We now prove $\varepsilon(r, s, p)$ satisfies the periodicity and duality properties in Theorem 4.

Proof of Theorem 4. Our strategy is to prove duality first, as duality implies periodicity.

(b) Suppose that $s = a + bp^m$ and $s' = -a + b'p^m$ where a, b, b' are integers. Now $s'' := s + s' = (b + b')p^m$ is a multiple of p^m. Let A be the homocyclic $F[x + y]$-module with relations $x^r = y^{s''} = xy - yx = 0$. By Lemma 10, the nilpotent transformation μ_{x+y} has minimal polynomial $t^{s''}$, and it corresponds to the uniform Jordan partition $\lambda(r, s'', p) = (s'', \ldots, s'')$. The action of μ_{x+y} on A gives submodules of the same dimension as the action of $\mu_{(1+x)(1+y)}$ on A as discussed in Section 2. The restriction of $\mu_{(1+x)(1+y)}$ to the submodule V_s of A is $J_r \otimes J_{s''-s} = J_r \otimes J_{s'}$ by Table 2, and this corresponds to the Jordan partition $\lambda(r, s', p) = (s' + \varepsilon'_1, \ldots, s' + \varepsilon'_r)$. Similarly, the restriction of $\mu_{(1+x)(1+y)}$ to A/V_s is $J_r \otimes J_s$ by Table 2, and this corresponds to the Jordan partition $\lambda(r, s, p) = (s + \varepsilon_1, \ldots, s + \varepsilon_r)$, say. Applying Lemma 11 with $M = A$, $N = V_s$, $n = s''$, $D = F[t]$, and $\alpha = t$ shows that $\lambda(r, s, p)$ has parts $s'' - (s' + \varepsilon'_i) = s - \varepsilon'_i$. Our ordering conventions $\varepsilon_1 \geqslant \cdots \geqslant \varepsilon_r$ and $\varepsilon'_1 \geqslant \cdots \geqslant \varepsilon'_r$ imply that $\varepsilon_{r-i+1} = -\varepsilon'_i$. Thus $\varepsilon(r, s, p)$ is the negative reverse of $\varepsilon(r, s', p)$. This proves part (b).

(a) Suppose that $s \equiv s' \pmod{p^m}$. Choose an integer s'' such that $s'' \geqslant r$ and $s'' \equiv -s \equiv -s' \pmod{p^m}$. By part (b), $\varepsilon(r, s'', p)$ is the negative reverse of both $\varepsilon(r, s)$ and $\varepsilon(r, s')$. Hence $\overline{\varepsilon(r, s, p)} = \overline{\varepsilon(r, s', p)}$, and therefore $\varepsilon(r, s, p) = \varepsilon(r, s', p)$. □

Henceforth, the phrase *by duality* will mean 'by Theorem 4(b)', and the phrase *by periodicity* will mean 'by Theorem 4(a)'.

Lemma 12. *If $r \leqslant s$ and $\varepsilon(r,s,p) = (\varepsilon_1, \ldots, \varepsilon_r)$, then $|\varepsilon_i| \leqslant r-1$ for $1 \leqslant i \leqslant r$.*

Proof. We noted in Section 2 that $(x+y)^{r+s-1} = 0$. Hence $\lambda_i \leqslant r+s-1$, and $\varepsilon_i \leqslant r-1$ for $1 \leqslant i \leqslant r$. By duality, $-(r-1) \leqslant \varepsilon_i$ and hence $|\varepsilon_i| \leqslant r-1$ for $1 \leqslant i \leqslant r$. □

Note that $|\varepsilon_i| \leqslant \max\{|\varepsilon_1|, |\varepsilon_r|\}$ as $\varepsilon_1 \geqslant \cdots \geqslant \varepsilon_r$. Proposition 13 shows that the upper bound of $r-1$ in Lemma 12 can be attained.

Proposition 13. *If $r \leqslant \min\{s, p^m\}$ and $s \equiv 1 \pmod{p^m}$, then*

$$\varepsilon(r,s,p) = (r-1, -1, \ldots, -1).$$

By duality, if $r \leqslant \min\{s, p^m\}$ and $s \equiv -1 \pmod{p^m}$, then $\varepsilon(r,s,p) = (1, \ldots, 1, -(r-1))$.

Proof. Suppose that $r \leqslant \min\{s, p^m\}$ and $s \equiv 1 \pmod{p^m}$. Let $q = p^{m+1}$. Since $\lambda(1,r,p) = (r)$, we have by [G, (2.5a)] that $\lambda(r, q-1, p) = (q, \ldots, q, q-r)$. Subtracting the uniform vector $(q-1, q-1, ..., q-1)$ gives $\varepsilon(r, p^{m+1}-1, p) = (1, \ldots, 1, 1-r)$. Then by duality, $\varepsilon(r,s,p) = (r-1, -1, \ldots, -1)$, as desired. □

Proposition 14. *If $2 \leqslant r \leqslant \min\{s, p^m\}$ and $s \equiv 2 \pmod{p^m}$, then*

$$\varepsilon(r,s,p) = \begin{cases} (r-2, r-2, -2, \ldots, -2) & \text{if } r \equiv 0 \pmod{p}, \\ (r-1, r-3, -2, \ldots, -2) & \text{if } r \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p}. \end{cases}$$

By duality, $2 \leqslant r \leqslant \min\{s, p^m\}$ and $s \equiv -2 \pmod{p^m}$ implies

$$\varepsilon(r,s,p) = \begin{cases} (2, \ldots, 2, 2-r, 2-r) & \text{if } r \equiv 0 \pmod{p}, \\ (2, \ldots, 2, 3-r, 1-r) & \text{if } r \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p}. \end{cases}$$

Proof. Suppose that $2 \leqslant r \leqslant \min\{s, p^m\}$ and $s \equiv 2 \pmod{p^m}$. Write $\varepsilon(2,r,p) = (a,b)$. Then

$$(a,b) = \begin{cases} (0,0) & \text{if } r \equiv 0 \pmod{p}, \\ (1,-1) & \text{if } r \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p}, \end{cases}$$

by Table 1, and $\lambda(2,r,p) = (r+a, r+b)$. Set $q = p^{m+1}$. By [G, (2.5a)], we have $\lambda(r, q-2, p) = (q, \ldots, q, q-r-b, q-r-a)$. Subtracting the uniform vector with all entries $q-2$ gives $\varepsilon(r, q-2, p) = (2, \ldots, 2, 2-r-b, 2-r-a)$. Finally, duality shows that $\varepsilon(r,s,p) = (r+a-2, r+b-2, -2, \ldots, -2)$, and the proposition follows. □

5. Which partitions $\lambda(r,s,p)$ arise?

This section addresses the question: Which partitions $\lambda(r,s,p)$ arise? Table 4 lists the number, n_r, of deviation vectors $\varepsilon(r,s,p)$ as both $s \geqslant r$ and p vary. Table 4, and parts of Table 1, were generated using Magma computer code available at [Gl]. Theorem 6 shows that $n_r \leqslant 2^{r-1}$. Although this bound is optimal for $r \leqslant 4$, Table 4 suggests that it may be a gross overestimate for large r.

TABLE 4. The number, n_r, of different $\varepsilon(r,s,p)$ vectors as $s \geqslant r$ and p vary.

r	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
n_r	1	2	4	8	14	24	28	45	61	78	94	118

The $i \times i$ matrix $A_i = \left(\binom{s+r-2i}{s-i+j-k}\right)_{0 \leqslant j,k \leqslant i-1}$ in (3) has integer entries. Thus $\delta_i := \det(A_i)$ is an integer, even though the formulas (5) and (6) appear to give rational values. As we are concerned with the case $\mathrm{char}(F) = p > 0$, we henceforth assume that δ_i, and the entries of A_i, lie in the field $\mathbb{F}_p$. The following recurrence for computing $\lambda(r,s,p)$ is established in Section 2 of [II].

Theorem 15 ([II], Theorem 2.2.9)**.** *Suppose $r \leqslant s$ and $p = \mathrm{char}(F) \geqslant 0$. The parts of $\lambda(r,s,p)$ can be computed recursively (in reverse order $\lambda_r, \lambda_{r-1}, \ldots, \lambda_1$) via*

$$\lambda_i = \begin{cases} r+s-2i+d(i) & \text{if } \delta_i \neq 0,\ \delta_{i-1} = \cdots = \delta_{i-(d(i)-1)} = 0 \text{ and } \delta_{i-d(i)} \neq 0, \\ \lambda_{i+1} & \text{if } \delta_i = 0. \end{cases} \tag{11}$$

When $\mathrm{char}(F) = 0$ the recurrence (11) gives the familiar formula $\lambda_i = r+s+1-2i$, because $d(i) = 1$ and the sequence $\delta_{i-1}, \ldots, \delta_{i-(d(i)-1)}$ is empty. Recall that $\delta_r = 1$.

We now prove Theorem 6, which says for fixed $r \geqslant 1$, that there are at most 2^{r-1} different deviation vectors $\varepsilon(r,s,p)$ as s, with $s \geqslant r$, and the prime p vary.

Proof of Theorem 6. The recurrence relation in Theorem 15 for the ith part λ_i of $\lambda(r,s,p)$ depends on whether or not the determinants $\delta_1, \ldots, \delta_{r-1}$ are zero in $\mathbb{F}_p$. Subtracting s gives a recurrence relation for ε_i that depends on whether $\delta_1, \ldots, \delta_{r-1}$ are zero or nonzero, and is independent of s. Hence there are at most 2^{r-1} choices for $\varepsilon(r,s,p)$ as s, with $s \geqslant r$, and the prime p vary. □

Theorem 6 has computational implications for the construction of Table 1. Theorem 7, and it proof, gives insight into the complexity of extending the r-values in Table 1.

Proof of Theorem 7. Fix r, and consider separately the cases: $p < r$, and $p \geqslant r$.

CASE $p < r$. By periodicity, we may assume that s equals one of $r, r+1, \ldots, r+p^m-1$. This gives p^m choices for s. Multiplying $p^{m-1} < r$ and $p < r$ gives $p^m < r^2$. This case involves considering less than r^2 values of s, and less than r values for the prime p. Thus we must compute a finite number of (less than r^3) deviation vectors $\varepsilon(r,s,p)$ in this case.

CASE $p \geqslant r$. By periodicity, we may assume that $s \in \{r, r+1, \ldots, r+p-1\}$ as $m = 1$. Indeed, we may assume that $s \in \{r, r+1, \ldots, r+(r-2)\}$ by Theorem 2, and by duality. For each of these $r-1$ choices for s, compute the $r-1$ integer determinants $\delta_1, \ldots, \delta_{r-1}$, and factor $\Delta := \delta_1 \cdots \delta_{r-1}$ using (6). Since the integers $\delta_1, \ldots, \delta_{r-1}$ depend only on r and s and $r \leqslant s \leqslant 2r-2$, the number of primes p dividing Δ is bounded by a function

of r. Thus the number of steps required to compute $\varepsilon(r,s,p)$ for $r \leqslant s \leqslant 2r-2$ and prime divisors p of Δ is bounded by a function of r. For the remaining primes p, the partition $\lambda(r,s,p)$ is standard, and $\varepsilon(r,s,p) = (r-1, r-3, \ldots, -(r-3), -(r-1))$. Thus a finite computation suffices to determine the values of $\varepsilon(r,s,p)$ with $r \leqslant \min\{p,s\}$. □

We mention a subtle point: it is not a finite computation to determine a mapping from the triples (r,s,p) where r is fixed and $s \geqslant r$ and p vary, to the set of of allowable values of $\varepsilon(r,s,p)$. The latter requires the computation of s modulo p for infinitely many s (and primes $p > r$), and this is an infinite computation.

We conclude by stating an open problem.

Problem 16. *Determine the asymptotic size as $r \to \infty$ of the number n_r of different vectors $\varepsilon(r,s,p)$ where $s \geqslant r$ and p vary. (Does the $\lim_{r\to\infty} n_r/2^{r-1}$ exist? C.f. Theorem 6.)*

Acknowledgements. We would like to thank Gary Seitz and Martin Liebeck for helpful conversations. We thank Neil Strickland for his answer to a question posed on MathOverflow[3] by the third author. We also thank Michael Barry for showing us his paper [B2]. The first and second authors acknowledge the support of the Australian Research Council Discovery Grant DP110101153. This work was done during the visit of the third author to School of Mathematics and Statistics, University of Western Australia, and he would like to thank the China Scholarship Council for its financial support.

References

[B] M. J. J. Barry, Generators for decompositions of tensor products of modules, *Arch. Math. (Basel)* **97** (2011) 503–512.

[B2] M. J. J. Barry, On a question of Glasby, Praeger, and Xia, *Comm. Algebra* **43** (2015), no. 10, 4231–4246.

[CK] I. S. Cohen and I. Kaplansky, Rings for which every module is a direct sum of cyclic modules. *Math. Z.* **54** (1951) 97–101.

[GPX] S. P. Glasby, C. E. Praeger, and B. Xia, Decomposing modular tensor products: 'Jordan partitions', their parts and p-parts, to appear in *Israel J. Math.*. (Preprint `arXiv:1403.4685v2`.)

[GPX2] S. P. Glasby, C. E. Praeger, and B. Xia, Jordan decompositions and 'Jordan permutations'. In prep..

[Gl] S. P. Glasby, Magma computer code available at `http://www.maths.uwa.edu.au/~glasby/`.

[Gr] A. Granville, Arithmetic Properties of Binomial Coefficients I: Binomial coefficients modulo prime powers. *Canadian Mathematical Society Conference Proceedings* **20** (1997) 253–275.

[G] J. A. Green, The modular representation algebra of a finite group, *Illinois J. Math.* **6** (1962) 607–619.

[HH] B. Hartley and T. O. Hawkes, *Rings, modules and linear algebra.* Chapman & Hall, London-New York, 1970. SBN: 412-09810-5.

[H] X. D. Hou, Elementary divisors of tensor products and p-ranks of binomial matrices, *Linear Algebra Appl.* **374** (2003) 255–274.

[3] http://mathoverflow.net/questions/134773/homocyclic-primary-module-over-pid

[II] K-i. Iima and R. Iwamatsu, On the Jordan decomposition of tensored matrices of Jordan canonical forms, *Math. J. Okayama Univ.* **51** (2009), 133–148.
[rL] R. Lawther, Jordan block sizes of unipotent elements in exceptional algebraic groups, *Comm. Algebra* **23** (1995), 4125–4156.
[jL] J. H. Lindsey II, Groups with a t. i. cyclic Sylow subgroup *J. Algebra* **30** (1974) 181–235.
[LS] M. W. Liebeck and G. M. Seitz, *Unipotent and nilpotent classes in simple algebraic groups and Lie algebras*. Mathematical Surveys and Monographs, **180**. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2012. ISBN: 978-0-8218-6920-8
[M1] J. D. McFall, How to compute the elementary divisors of the tensor product of two matrices, *Linear and Multilinear Algebra* **7** (1979), 193–201.
[M2] J. D. McFall, On elementary divisors of the tensor product of two matrices, *Linear Algebra Appl.* **33** (1980), 67–86.
[N1] C. W. Norman, On Jordan bases for two related linear mappings, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* **175** (1993) 96–104.
[N2] C. W. Norman, On Jordan bases for the tensor product and Kronecker sum and their elementary divisors over fields of prime characteristic, *Linear Multilinear Algebra* **56** (2008) 415–451.
[P] C. E. Praeger, Note on primitive permutation groups of prime power degree, *J. London Math. Soc.* (2) **13** (1976) 191–192.
[R] T. Ralley, Decomposition of products of modular representations, *J. London Math. Soc.* **44** (1969) 480–484.
[R1] J.-C. Renaud, The decomposition of products in the modular representation ring of a cyclic group of prime power order, *J. Algebra* **58** (1979) 1–11.
[R2] J.-C. Renaud, Recurrence relations in a modular representation algebra, *Bull. Austral. Math. Soc.* **26** (1982) 215–219.
[S] B. Srinivasan, The modular representation ring of a cyclic p-group, *Proc. London Math. Soc.* **14** (1964) 677–688.
[T1] A. Trampus, A canonical basis for the matrix transformation $X \to AXB$, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* **14** (1966) 153–160.
[T2] A. Trampus, A canonical basis for the matrix transformation $X \to AX + XB$, *J. Math. Anal. Appl* **14** (1966) 242–252.

(Glasby) Centre for Mathematics of Symmetry and Computation, University of Western Australia, 35 Stirling Highway, Crawley 6009, Australia.
Email: GlasbyS@gmail.com; WWW: http://www.maths.uwa.edu.au/∼glasby/
Also affiliated with Department of Mathematics, University of Canberra, Australia.

(Praeger) Centre for Mathematics of Symmetry and Computation, University of Western Australia, 35 Stirling Highway, Crawley 6009, Australia.
Email: Cheryl.Praeger@uwa.edu.au; WWW: http://www.maths.uwa.edu.au/∼praeger
Also affiliated with King Abdulaziz University, Jeddah, Saudi Arabia.

(Xia) Beijing International Center for mathematical Research, Peking University, Beijing 100871, People's Republic of China.
Email: binzhouxia@pku.edu.cn